



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,200	12/18/2003	Charles R. Obranovich	SYS-P-1230 (8364-90585)	2226
7590 04/02/2009				
Patent Services Group Honeywell International, Inc. 101 Columbia Road P. O. Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962			EXAMINER PAUL, DISLER	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/02/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/740,200

Applicant(s)

OBRANOVICH ET AL.

Examiner

DISLER PAUL

Art Unit

2614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-26; 32; 35-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-26; 32; 35-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 11-17, 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter such as "the test signal is generated at a plurality of different frequencies" which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Response to Amendment

The applicant's amended claim wherein "the test signal is generated at a plurality of different frequencies" as in claims (11,37) and "each of the microphone is capable of receiving substantially all audio in an associated geographic region in which the microphone is located" as in claims (4,7,9) have been analyzed and rejected (see the office action below).

Further the applicant's argument wherein the "conditions detectors with at least some of the microphones carried by respective one of the detectors" in regard to claim 2 have been considered and is non-persuasive, because: the combined teaching of Albus et al. and Koike et al. as a whole, disclose of having the detectors and

microphone. But, while, they fail to disclose of the having at least some of microphones carried by respective ones of the detectors. But, official notice is taken the concept of having such specific wherein the least some of microphones carried by respective ones of the detectors is merely an obvious variation of the designer's preference- with no unexpected result produced.

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 7; 18-20; 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Baranek et al. (US 2003/0021188 A1).

Re claim 7, Baranek et al. disclosed a system comprising: a plurality of fixedly mountable microphones and each of the microphones is capable of receiving substantially all audio in an associated geographic region in which that microphone is located and circuits coupled to respective microphones including circuitry for evaluating intelligibility of audio received by the respective microphones and generating an indicator of intelligibility on a per microphone basis , the circuits each include a network output port (fig.1 w (16,12,14,18-20); par [0022,0026, 0031]/sonic wave or detector and level with determining the strength as per for determining which is closest to incident for each area or detect sound level and decibel of transducer at remote place), and a plurality of distributed detectors of

airborne ambient conditions (par [0036]/alarms, smoke may be implemented).

Re claim 18, Baraneck et al. discloses an apparatus comprising: at least one ambient airborne condition sensor; control circuits and a microphone coupled to the control circuits, the control circuits establishing an intelligibility index in response to signals from the microphone and the microphone inherently being capable of receiving signals at substantially all audible frequencies (fig.2 w (12,14); par [0022,0026, 0031,0035]; to be detected by microphones and monitoring sonic wave).

Re claim 19, the apparatus as in claim 18, which provides at least one port for connection of external microphone (fig.2 (14,18,24) to monitor outside noise and send).

Re claim 20, an apparatus as in claim 18, which include the network communications port (fig.2).

Re claim 22, the apparatus as in claim 18 with the ambient condition sensor, wherein the ambient condition sensor comprises at least one of a smoke sensor, a flame sensor, a thermal sensor or a gas sensor (par [0036]).

Re claim 23, the apparatus as in claim 22, wherein the control circuits include a processor with inherent of having the executable instructions for carrying out intelligibility index processing (fig.2; par [0035]/memory and storing/software to enable the processing).

Re claim 24, the apparatus as in claim 23 which includes a network communications port, the port facilitating coupling electrical energy to at least the control circuits, and coupling intelligibility indices at least from the control circuits to a medium (fig.2 (14,18,20)).

Re claim 25, an apparatus as in claim 24 where the communications port includes an interface for carrying out bi-directional communication via a medium ("fig.2 (24)/to carry bi-directional communication").

Re claim 26, the apparatus as in claim 25, where the interface includes circuits coupled to at least one of an electrical cable or an optical cable (par [0030]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-6; 9-10; 32,35-36; 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranek et al. (US 2003/0021188 A1) and Kimura et al. (US 2003/0128850 A1).

Re claim 4, Baranek et al. disclosed a system comprising: a plurality of fixedly mountable microphones; each of the microphones is capable of receiving substantially all audio in an associated geographic region in which that microphone is located and circuits coupled to respective microphones including circuitry for evaluating intelligibility of audio received by the respective microphones and generating an indicator of intelligibility on a per microphone basis (fig.2 w (12,14); par [0022,0026, 0031-0032]/detectors as per locations in the buildings with determining the strength as per for determining which is closest to incident) and the circuits each include a network output port and circuitry that produces pre-stored speech intelligibility test signals and at least one audio output device which is separate from the microphone (par [0027,0035]/also audible speakers with stored speech to produced and have microphones accordingly).

While, Baranek et al. disclose of the detecting the speech intelligibility test signals and being received as per microphone, however, Baranek et al. fail to disclose the output device specifically audibly produce a pres-stored speech intelligibility test

signals which will be received by the microphones. But, Kimura et al. disclose of such specifically audibly produce the pres-stored speech intelligibility test signals which will be received by the microphones (par [0028, 0039]). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination wherein specifically audibly produce the pres-stored speech intelligibility test signals which will be received by the microphones for enabling self-diagnosis level operation by the loudspeaker.

Re claim 5, a system as in claim 4, which includes control circuits coupled to the microphones and the audio output device, the control circuits couple electrical representations of the speech intelligibility test signals to the output device (fig.2 (14,30); ; par [0036]/outputs and microphone detecting).

Re claim 6, a system as in claim 5 which includes a plurality of audio output devices coupled to the control circuits(fig.2 (30); par [0026,0036]/each detect (12) with corresponding audio (30)).

Re claim 9, Baraneck et al. disclosed of a system comprising: a plurality of fixedly mountable microphones, each of the microphones is capable of receiving substantially all audio in an associated geographic region in which that microphone is located and circuits coupled to respective microphones including circuitry for evaluating intelligibility of audio received by the respective microphones and generating an indicator of intelligibility on a per microphone basis,

the circuits each include a network output port and where the control circuits which include inherent feature of at least one of logic or executable instructions for producing speech intelligibility test signals to be audibly output by the at least one audio output device that is separate from the microphones (see claim 4 rejection analysis).

Re claim 10, the System as in claim 9 which includes inherency of having additional executable instructions for processing the speech intelligibility test signals received from the respective microphones (fig.12; par [0035]/all software implemented with memory and processor).

Re claim 32, Baranek et al. disclose of a system comprising: control circuits for producing pre-stored electrical representations of speech intelligibility test signals; at least one audible output device coupled to the control circuits to audibly emit the speech intelligibility test signals, and a plurality of spaced apart acoustic sensors, each of the acoustic sensors is capable of receiving substantially all audio in an associated geographic region in which that acoustic sensor is located and circuits coupled to the respective acoustic sensors including circuitry for evaluating intelligibility of audio received by the respective acoustic sensors and generating an indicator of intelligibility on a per acoustic sensor basis, wherein

the at least one audio output device is separate from the acoustic sensors (see claim 4 rejection analysis).

Re claim 35, a system as in claim 32, which include a plurality of audio output devices coupled to the control circuits (fig.2 (30)).

Re claim 36, the system as in claim 32, which includes a plurality of distributed ambient condition detectors (par [0036]).

Re claim 38, the system as in claim 32 where the control circuits include the inherent executable instructions for producing speech intelligibility test signals to be audibly output by the at least one audio output device (par [0035]).

Re claims 39, the system as in claim 38 which includes additional executable instructions for processing the speech intelligibility test signals received from the respective sensors (see claim 38 as above).

Re claim 40, Baranek disclose of the apparatus comprising: a source of pre-stored intelligibility test signals; a plurality of loud speakers coupled to the source so as to broadcast selected test signals; a plurality of microphones which are separate from the plurality of loudspeakers and which receive at least some of the broadcast test signals, each of the microphones in the plurality of is capable of receiving substantially all audio in an associated geographical

regions in which the microphone is located and and having at least one detection circuit coupled to a respective microphone for automatically generating a speech intelligibility indicium associated with the respective microphone (see claim 14 rejection analysis).

Re claim 41, the system as in claim 40, the detectors are selected from a class which includes smoke detectors and gas detectors (par 0036]. But, the combined teaching of Baraneck et al. and kimura as a whole, fail to disclose of where at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of the microphones. But, it is noted the concept of having the at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of the microphones is merely an obvious variation of the designer's need with no unexpected result. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination with having at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of the microphones for making used of the spacing in the microphone chamber and reduce wiring cost.

9. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baraneck et al. (US 2003/0021188 A1) and Kimura et al. (US 2003/0128850 A1) and Craven et al. (US 6,760,451 B1).

Re claim 37, Baraneck disclose of the system comprising: control circuits for producing electrical representations of speech intelligibility test signals at a frequency and having a plurality of spaced apart acoustic sensors (fig.1-2/control circuits and producing electrical speech signal and sensors to analyze the signals).

But, Baraneck fail to disclose of at least one audible output device coupled to the control circuits to audibly emit the speech intelligibility test signals. But, Kimura et al. disclose of such specifically one audible output device coupled to the control circuits to audibly emit the speech intelligibility test signals (par [0028, 0039]). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination wherein specifically one audible output device coupled to the control circuits to audibly emit the speech intelligibility test signals for enabling self-diagnosis level operation by the loudspeaker.

While, the combined teaching of Braneck and Kimura et al. as a whole, disclose of the audio output device for audibly emit the speech intelligibility test signal, But, they fail to disclose of the specific wherein emitting the test signals at a plurality of different frequencies. But, Craven et al. disclose of a system wherein emitting the test signals at a plurality of different frequencies (col.27 line 50-65; col.28 line 5-20). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination wherein

emitting the test signals at a plurality of different frequencies for compensating the effects of acoustic stage in the signal path.

The combined teaching of Baraneck and kimura et al. and Craven et al. as a whole, disclose of the plurality of spaced apart acoustic sensors; the acoustic sensors can receive the speech intelligibility test signals at substantially all of the frequencies in the plurality of different frequencies and circuits coupled to respective acoustic sensors including circuitry for evaluating intelligibility of audio received by the respective acoustic sensors and generating an indicator of intelligibility on a per acoustic sensor basis and the plurality of smoke detectors (fig.2 (14,24); par [0036]).

The combined teaching of Baraneck and Craven et al. as a whole, fail to disclose of fail to disclose of the wherein at least some of the detectors carry respective one of the acoustic sensor. But, it is noted the concept of having of at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of acoustic sensors is merely an obvious variation of the designer's need with no unexpected result generated. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination with having of at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of acoustic sensors for optimally making used of the spacing in the microphone chamber and reduce cost.

10. Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baraneck et al. (US 2003/0021188 A1) and Craven et al. (US 6,760,451 B1).

Re claim 11, Baraneck et al. disclose of the method comprising: generating providing at least one machine generated at least one speech intelligibility test signal (fig.2; par [0025]/to generate test signal).

While, Baraneck et al. disclose of the test signal is generated (par [0035]/memory with recorded gunshots or voice prints for generating test signals).

But, Baraneck et al. fail to disclose of the specific wherein the test signal is generated at a plurality of different frequencies. But, Craven et al. disclose of a system wherein the test signal is generated at a plurality of different frequencies (col.27 line 50-65; col.28 line 5-20). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination wherein the test signal is generated at a plurality of different frequencies for compensating the effects of acoustic stage in the signal path.

The combined teaching of Baraneck and Craven et al. as a whole, disclose of sensing the speech intelligibility test signal at substantially all of the different frequencies in the plurality at at least one fixed location; evaluating the intelligibility of the sense speech intelligibility test signal((fig.2 w (12,14); par [0022,0026,

0031]/detector with determining the strength as per for determining which is closest to incident).

Re claim 12, a method as in claim 11, which includes generating a plurality of speech intelligibility test signal(par [0035]/memory with recorded gunshots or voice prints for generating test signals).

Re claim 13, a method as in claim 11 which includes sensing the speech intelligibility test signal at a plurality of spaced apart, fixed locations ("fig.2 w (14)").

Re claim 14, a method as in claim 13 which includes: transmitting the sensed speech intelligibility test signal from the plurality of locations to a common site and then processing same to evaluate intelligibility thereof ("par {0025-0026").

Re claim 15, a method as in claim 14, wherein the processing of at common site. But, the combined teaching of Baranek and Craven et al. as a whole, fail to disclose of the visually presenting processing results.

But, official notice is taken the concept of visually presenting processing results is well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination wherein visually presenting processing results for

enabling the user with the ability to determined the exact location of the incident.

Re claim 16, the method as in claim 14, the sensed speech intelligibility test signals receive initial processing prior to being coupled to the common site (fig.2 (20,22)).

Re claim 17, the method as in claim 16 with the initial processing conducted on a per location basis and where initially processed results are each indicative of intelligibility of received audio (see claim 16 rejection).

11. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albus et al. (2002/0015502 A1) and further in view of Koike et al. (5,635,903).

Re claim 2, Albus et al. disclosed a system comprising: a plurality of fixedly mountable microphones (fig.1 wt (20)/plurality of microphones); and circuits coupled to respective microphones including circuitry for evaluating intelligibility of audio received by the respective microphones and generating an indicator of intelligibility on a per microphone basis (fig.1 wt (20-24); par[0027-0028]/evaluating audio signal with noise correlating), the circuits each include a network output port (fig.1 wt (2)).

But, Albus et al. fail to disclose of including a plurality of ambient condition detectors with at least some of microphones carried by respective ones of the detectors. But, Koike et al. disclose of a vehicle system wherein further including a plurality of ambient condition detectors (fig.1 wt (2)). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination with the system wherein further including a plurality of ambient condition detectors for purpose of generating simulating sound dependent on the ambient signals detected.

The combined teaching of Albus et al. and Koike et al. as a whole, fail to disclose of the at least some of microphones carried by respective ones of the detectors. But, official notice is taken the concept of having the least some of microphones carried by respective ones of the detectors is merely an obvious variation of the designer's preference-with no unexpected result produced. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Albus et al. and Koike et al. as a whole, with having the at least some of microphones carried by respective ones of the detectors for making used of the spacing in the microphone chamber and reduce wiring cost.

Re claims 3, the system in claim 2, where at least some of the circuits are carried by respective ones of the detectors coupled to

respective microphones (koike, fig.7) and also carried by the same detector (see claim 2 rejection).

12. Claims 8; 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baraneck et al. (US 2003/0021188 A1).

Re claim 8, a system as in claim 7, the detectors are selected from a class which includes smoke detectors and gas detectors (par 0036]. But, Baraneck et al. fail to disclose of where at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of the microphones. But, it is noted the concept of having the at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of the microphones is merely an obvious variation of the designer's need with no unexpected result. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination with al. at least some of the detectors carry respective ones of the microphones for making used of the spacing in the microphone chamber and reduce wiring cost.

Re claim 21, the apparatus as in claim 20 with the speech intelligibility, But, Baraneck et al. fail to disclose of the specific wherein the intelligibility index comprises at least one of STI, RASTI, SII, or, a subset of one of STI, RASTI, SII. But, official notice is taken the concept of having the intelligibility index comprises at least one of STI, RASTI, SII, or, a subset of one of STI,

RASTI, SII is well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified the combination with incorporating as speech intelligibility index comprises at least one of STI, RASTI, SII, or, a subset of one of STI, RASTI, SII for optimally making used of the spacing in the microphone chamber and reduce wiring cost.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Disler Paul whose telephone number is 571-270-1187. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Vivian Chin/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614